

1 **A.** I did not, and DEC witness Kerin has provided no citation to back his contention
2 that I have done so.

3 **Q. DID SOUTH CAROLINA CUSTOMERS BENEFIT MORE FROM CAMA THAN**
4 **THEY WOULD HAVE UNDER FEDERAL CCR REQUIREMENTS?**

5 **A.** On page 14 of my testimony, I included the preamble of the May 14, 2014 version
6 of the North Carolina Coal Ash Management Act (Senate Bill 729) (Exhibit DJW-4.4) as
7 a measure of legislative intent. It is abundantly clear from this language that the members
8 of the General Assembly were concerned about (among other things) (1) six decades of ash
9 mismanagement in North Carolina, (2) the failure and release of CCR into the Dan River
10 in February 2014, and (3) protection of North Carolina surface water and ground water
11 resources for their best usage. Consequently, CAMA was appropriately focused on
12 protecting public health and safety as well as the environment in North Carolina.
13 Accordingly, CAMA includes protections above and beyond what is required in the federal
14 CCR Rules and these protections accrue primarily to the benefit of North Carolina residents
15 and not to the benefit of South Carolina residents.

16 **Q. WILL YOU UPDATE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY BASED ON**
17 **INFORMATION THAT BECOMES AVAILABLE?**

18 **A.** Yes. ORS fully reserves the right to revise its recommendations via supplemental
19 testimony should new information not previously provided by the Company, or other
20 sources, become available.

21 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?**

22 **A.** Yes.